

COPY 1 of 5 COPIES

(NOTE: Copies 3, 4 and 5 were
excerpted to include pp. 1 to
11 $\frac{1}{2}$, incl., and pp. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 19,
incl.)

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

24th Meeting

Thursday, 4 March 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

02011

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

24th Meeting

Thursday, 4 March 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General, Chairman

Robert Amory, Jr.
DD/I, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
DC/PP, Member

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
DD/TR, Alt. for D/TR, Member

[REDACTED]
Chief of Operations, Alt. for DD/P, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
DAD/O, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
AD/Communications, Member

Harrison G. Reynolds
AD/Personnel, Member

25X1A9a

Lawrence K. White
ADD/A, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Executive Secretary

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Secretariat

[REDACTED]
Reporter

. . . The 24th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., 5 March 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We will come to order, gentlemen. The first item on the agenda is the minutes of the last meeting. Are there any desired corrections or changes?

[REDACTED] I have none.

25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If not, we will consider them approved as submitted.

Item 2 on the agenda returns us to the principal item of last week's Career Service Board meeting, the Selective Rotation Program, prepared by the Office of Personnel. You will find before you a memorandum entitled "Proposed Rotation Programs for Junior Professional Personnel", which is being submitted as an alternate proposal by the DD/A. Is that correct, Red?

(Following is the paper referred to above)

PROPOSED ROTATION PROGRAMS FOR JUNIOR PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL
(To Be Accomplished Concurrently)

1. Agency Office Orientation Course
 - a. The course would be offered annually, and the duration of each course would be approximately one year.
 - b. The purpose of the course would be to provide carefully selected junior professional employees with a better understanding of the activities, problems, and inter-relationships of each element of the Agency.
 - c. Each Agency office and staff, in its turn, would offer planned instruction and orientation to the trainees, following an approved schedule.
 - d. The employees who attend the course would be selected as follows:
 - (1) Course quotas would be assigned to the Agency's Career Service Boards.
 - (2) Each Career Service Board would nominate junior professional employees with that career designation who have the greatest potentiality (nominations would exceed the assigned quota). Each nomination would be accompanied by appropriate justification and the comments of the heads of the organizational components concerned.
 - (3) Final selection of students (observing minimum quotas) would be accomplished by an Agency committee formed for this purpose.
 - e. Administrative control of the Agency Office Orientation Course would be a responsibility of the Assistant Director (Personnel).
 - f. When necessary, students would be assigned to Career Development Slots while undergoing this training, with the

approval of the CIA Career Service Board.

2. Career Development Plan Rotation Program

a. Under the provisions of this program, a junior professional employee would perform specified duties or receive training for a fixed period of time in an Agency component other than the one to which assigned. At the conclusion of the rotation training, he would receive an assignment from his Career Service Board in which his increased skills could be used to the greatest benefit of the Agency.

b. Each such rotation assignment would conform to the individual's career development plan as approved by his Career Service Board and the Agency officer who is advised by the Board.

c. As a general rule, a rotation assignment under this program would be for more than six months but not to exceed two years.

d. The Agency's Career Service Boards would have at least a fixed minimum number of employees in such rotation assignment at any given time.

e. When necessary, Career Development Slots would be used for employees in this program, with the approval of the CIA Career Service Board.

MR. WHITE: Kirk, if I could answer that question you asked me at the last meeting, whether I disagreed with the Personnel plan as outlined, the answer is "yes", and I had a number of reasons why I disagreed with it. I would like to propose this plan not as a finished product, but at least as something closer to what I think we might be shooting at than the plan that was submitted by Personnel last week.

There is only one error in this paper which I have submitted, and that is in paragraph 1.e. It's not a major point, but I question whether the subject program should be under the Office of Personnel. Personally, I believe if we are going to have such a program it should be under the Office of Training and run in conjunction with the Junior Officer Trainee Program. I studied this plan. Some of the things that occurred to me and the reasons why I didn't agree with it, it seemed to me that there was such a wide variety of organizational components and activities in the Agency that these young people would not spend enough time in any one activity to be productive in anything except the simplest task. I also think that with people in that age bracket and grade it would be difficult to maintain their interest and their motivation over a period as long as five years. I rather thought that maybe one year was as long as you could hope to maintain their interest and real motivation. Any individual receiving this training would be rotated over such a wide range of activities, operations, etc.,

that at the end of this period I think he would be thoroughly familiar with the organization of the Agency and the inter-relationships that exist, but I am not convinced that at the end of that time he would be particularly well qualified, anymore than he was in the beginning, for productive work in any particular component. I rather think that each person is more inclined to develop logically along the lines indicated by his particular ability and his particular temperament and aptitude, motivations, etc., and that this development, particularly at the junior professional level, would be predominantly in a specific area of professional specialty rather than the broad treatment which this other plan proposed.

. . . Mr. Amory joined the Meeting . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Excuse me a second. Does Mr. Amory have a copy of what we are discussing? What we are talking about now is the proposed rotation program for personnel, which the DD/A has presented as a modification of the Office of Personnel's original paper.

MR. WHITE: I think, also, at the end of this rather prolonged period there may be some difficulty in finding an acceptable assignment, because some of these people--theoretically it shouldn't be, but I think practically, if you take a man out of the responsibility of any particular office and rotate him and train him for as long as five years, unless he is a real ball of fire you may have some trouble getting people to welcome him into any particular office. I think we will have some difficulty in evaluating these individuals over such a prolonged period. I think the period is too long, in more ways than one. The cost of putting 120 individuals in this program for three years, the salaries alone would be somewhere in excess of three million dollars. Of course, if we are going to absorb that within the ceiling, which I think we should, that is not a budgetary problem, at least insofar as the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress is concerned. So I rather felt that picking up sort of where

25X1A [REDACTED] left off here the other day, that he had career plans for a number of his people, but the fulfillment of those career plans was dependent on the other offices in the Agency being willing to take his people and give them the training that he thought they ought to have, and so forth. So I have serious reservations about the effectiveness of a program that lifts these 120 people out from their home base, so to speak, their parent offices, and places them

under an entirely independent office for a prolonged period, during which time they would normally expect, I feel sure, to have received promotions along with other people in the Agency, and then finding a suitable place for them at the end of that time. And as I said, I doubt whether or not they can be productive during that training period.

So I believe that something tied closer into the career service plan for an individual as developed by his own Career Service Board wherein the remainder of the Agency components would cooperate in training this individual along the lines that his Career Service Board thought he ought to have, would be a better way to try to tackle this thing.

I also felt that maybe we are trying to run before we learn to walk. Instead of taking 120 people maybe we should start with a much smaller number. I think I have suggested 20 or 25 here to get started with.

So this paper which I have reproduced here--you all have a copy of it--was an attempt to reflect my thoughts as to how I thought this might be better done, at least to start with, than the Personnel proposal. I don't say it is a finished product at all, and I'm not even sure that it represents a complete, finished product of my own thinking, but it's much closer to what I think we ought to try to do than the other paper.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am in disagreement only on two of the major points you mentioned, Red. One is the presumption that some of the individuals in this program might not have an office to return to, because I think the whole program will be foredoomed to failure if every individual put into it isn't a pretty highly qualified individual whom the office would want very much to have back. In other words, whether we start with 20 or 120, I think they should be the brightest of this group that we look forward to, because we are still, as I understand it, following the principle that these will be potential junior executives once they come out of this.

MR. WHITE: Kirk, I would agree with that if you shortened the period, but I think if you put a grade 7 from the Logistics Office, say, into this program, the Logistics Office would be glad to have him back as a 9, but if you take him for four or five years, to keep him interested he will have to be promoted along with his contemporaries, and he might get up to an 11 or 13 by the time Logistics gets him back.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Maybe one of the reasons why I don't stumble over

that block is because I have never yet, in my own mind, come to a time period. I wonder whether it is practical to set a time period for a program like this, because it seems to me it might vary with the individuals.

MR. REYNOLDS: As a matter of record, Kirk, I would like to point out to the Board that the paper submitted by the Office of Personnel was substantially that asked for by the Board, and the time element was put in there because people around this table said they thought that sufficient time must be allowed to give an all-round training throughout the Agency in these offices. I just want to point that out, that we did it because we were told to do it, and it was our first shot at the thing. I remember that the time element was discussed as one that would have to cover something in the neighborhood of five years, on the outside, and we said we thought three to five years was giving sufficient elasticity. I personally don't agree with Red's one year. I don't think you could do it in a year.

MR. WHITE: I don't believe you can, and I don't propose that you give a man a year to get him generally oriented, and that is the end. My proposal would be pointed toward giving him certain training for a year, after which he becomes productive for a year or two, and then you give him more training.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the second point of your contention that I disagree with. You stated that if we adopted it for 120, which I think we all agree is a theoretical figure, it would cost the Agency in the neighborhood of three million dollars. I disagree with you rather strongly on that because to my mind the second major criteria for successful operation of this, is that the individuals in it be gainfully employed while they are in the process of rotation. Here we are dealing with personnel who know CIA, we aren't dealing with people we bring in from the outside world who have to go through the whole orientation program to know the Agency and know where their careers lie, we are dealing with known quantities. So it seems to me the maximum acquaintance period would be around three months before they started to pull their weight. And it would be assumed that they were gainfully employed from then on for whatever period they stayed in that office. If not, there would be two faults, one the individuals, and two, the supervisors for not seeing to it they got their money's worth. So I wouldn't say the loss which could be chargeable to training per se, would be anymore than a quarter of the salaries of the individuals.

Going on to Harry's point about one year, it seems to me that the

minimum an individual should stay in any one office would be six months and the maximum would be not much more than a year. I have always counseled youngsters and sort of set the pattern for myself, that you ought to give a year to any job to see whether you really don't like it as much as you think you don't like it, or aren't as well qualified for it as you think you should be. Of course, that would vary a lot for individuals. You have to recognize the fact that some of these individuals through the faults of the Career Service Boards, through the faults of the individuals, through the misassessments, etc., are going to get misplaced. Consequently, we would want to move them faster. But generally speaking, six months as the minimum and a year as the maximum, and somewhere in between as the average.

I've been doing a little homework in the nature of auxiliary work because in the inspection of the Office of Training we are in the middle of the JOT program, and I set myself the task of talking to every single JOT and getting his reaction to that program, and then talking to the people who used JOT's and getting their reaction as consumers, and the more I see of that and the more we discuss this, the more this seems to be a projection of that program.

MR. WHITE: I agree.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: A projection utilizing individuals already on board rather than going out and getting them. Further, the more I talk to people in that program the more it seems to me that the maximum you can rotate is about three offices and you have rotated the individuals out. If you go beyond that he gets into jobs for which he is not interested and he gets himself so thoroughly spread that he is not good for any one of them.

25X1A9a MR. WHITE: I agree with that.

MR. [REDACTED] I entirely agree with that, and it appears that some of them have rotated to the point where they begin to wonder what it's all about and when can they get started. They really want a job instead of a succession of little jobs.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] That is perfectly true. And I agree also that that is an extension of the JOT program. But it was my contention that it would have to take more than a year on the grounds that if you are actually going to have this at the beginning of a career service program, that these men should actually serve and contribute in the places they went - all of this not so much in the interest of training them, necessarily, but in the interest of starting

a mechanism going here which then would pick up more dirt as we went along and enable us to gradually, throughout the younger group, get an actual, in-fact Career Service Program going.

Now I agree also with the statement that I think 120 is too many to start with. I think we should start smaller, because the idea is to get something started, and when we get it going I think it would pick up dirt as it goes along, if we do it right. And as time goes on and more and more young people come in they will be picked up by this device.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] You will have a waiting list of young people who want to get into it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not over a long period because presuming we continue the JOT program there would come a period, say in 5 or 10 years from now, when we would have picked up and caught all the junior executives with that potential and caliber in the Agency, and the rest coming in would be coming in through that JOT mechanism.

25X1A9a

MR. REYNOLDS: Kirk, I agree that 120 is too many. I think that was just a shot in the dark.

MR. [REDACTED] These are second thoughts now.

25X1A9a

MR. REYNOLDS: The other point which to me differs from the JOT is that we are taking mature men who are in the Agency rather than someone that we picked out of college, or what have you; and, secondly, that our plan is given to the man rather than the man picking his plan. It's a rather more definite plan than the JOT, as I see it. It's not firm, but this thing envisages that you would lay it out pretty carefully. The plan was an element of importance in this other thought that we had.

MR. [REDACTED] Kirk, I believe in the principle of rotation and the establishment of some mechanism whereby rotation can be controlled, in effect we will have to have some sort of a quota basis. I also think this JOT program is a very useful device if for no other purpose than getting the brighter, younger people and giving them a chance at shaking themselves down in something that they like and are fitted for. But I really question the long-term wisdom of setting up a formalized program of rotation under which you would formally recruit people and tell them, in effect, "Look, you are among God's chosen here, and we are going to give you a chance to really make something of yourselves here." I'm afraid they would all get the idea that they are privileged

individuals. Such a method would very likely ruin a fair percentage of people you chose for it. I wonder if we can't set up some "God watching the sparrows fall" kind of system here, whereby we can keep an eye on these younger people and assist and encourage their rotation as it seems desirable, without making such a terrific point of it to people themselves.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I couldn't agree with you more. We don't want to spoil the individuals. I think that is the part of general Agency discipline which it is essential to maintain. We don't want to create what Bedell Smith first called an "elite corps", which everybody agreed sounded an awful lot more like the Schutzstaffel than we wanted to have in CIA. I think the reason, John, that we started out at this--just following the train of thought back--was because the Board seemed to generally agree that rotation under the present system was more or less hit or miss and a case of job-shopping by the individual or piracy by an office, so that there wasn't a planned rotation. It was either an office going out to grab another man in another office or an individual wanting to change jobs either because he had a yen to get into the covert side or the analytic side, but there was no schematic process about it.

Now, following that train of thought, it seems we have suddenly come over to this other corner where we have presented to us a very fine plan but, as you point out, a very firm mechanism or machinery. So it seems what we want to do is probably end up somewhere in the middle of having a guidance system. The thing about Red's paper that appeals to me is that it throws the principal burden on the Career Service Boards, with a supervisory master body to needle, encourage, persuade, and get the mechanism going, which probably should be this Board.

MR. [REDACTED] I think so.

MR. [REDACTED]: Or a career planning group of this Board that would watch over it continuously.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: A sub-group of this Board consisting of three or four members of this Board.

MR. [REDACTED]: I was going to propose the very laudible purposes of this plan can be achieved by some device like that.

On the plan itself, I do have the same objection John has, that however you define it, it would become an elite corps. It should be possible to follow the careers of the men without their knowing they are being followed,

where they would stick to the jobs they are now doing and as far as they know their purpose is to know that job as well as they can. But if you identify these people in grades, say, 9 to 12, and have a mechanism in this Board for seeing to it that the PER's and the files and any other relevant material is known to this Board, and then judged for both the time of rotation--not arriving at any six months or any other arbitrary figure, but when it becomes appropriate for an individual, and the kind of rotation he should have--so that you are following the careers of the people who are likely to come along and whom you want to foster in the same way this would tend to do, but without any of the apparatus. You also, in that case, would not have to worry about slots or money because every man would have his slot and his salary in the job he was performing as well as was required of him, and better, but you would have a mechanism here for following those hundred or how many people you were interested in developing.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] And as Red points out in his paper, the Career Development Slots which exist, could be used to supplement and amplify that kind of a program.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] We are trying to do something like that in a few instances. OCI and ONE have told us the type of people they want in the staff a year or so from now--just a few people--without telling them, and we will give them courses that the Chairman can describe, and sort of bring them up so that two years from now if he wants them they will be available and trained along the lines he wants them trained. They will also probably be rotated to OCI or ONE for a short period initially. It's just a shot in the dark, but it's the unconscious approach.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] What breaks the rotation program now is the natural tendency to want to hang on to the good people. But if those people were identified to this Board and followed, that could be done away with in everybody's interest.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I am interested in a Career Service System working eventually in such a fashion that a responsible officer will come to his other offices and say: "Chum, I have a hell of a good man here and I think you will profit by including him in your specialty"--whatever it is, and run on a rather gentlemanly sort of basis, rather than everybody trying to hang onto his good people and trying to palm off his bad ones to any sucker who will take them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, the general consensus seems to be that what we want to end up with, then, is principally establishing a quota of how many should be put into a rotation system, allocating the quota among the major Career Service Boards, laying down the ground rules as to who should be nominated for those quotas, and then this Board sitting on top of the checkers' match to see that the various reds and blacks are filled and moved.

MR. WHITE: That sounds good to me, Kirk.

25X1A9a

MR. AMORY: The exclusive method is not all as black as some people are painting it, and at present from our side and [REDACTED] shop--this is not the exclusive method, this is an additional method.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That was determined at the very start, that this was to supplement what is already proceeding at the present time.

MR. AMORY: The only thing I would comment on both papers is the idea that you rotate several times consecutively. I think it is a lot better to look at a 30-year career as a trunk -- a guy rotates out between the second and fourth year and then he comes back to his basic thing for three or five years, and about the time he is getting the idea he is a darn good fellow on that, then he rotates out for another three years, rather than three rotations in his late 20's and then feeling that for the next 20 years he goes to Florida translating Armenian documents.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That sounds like a rosy career. (Laughter)

I think the next step, then, is to get a statement flushing out more or less what has been described.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Since the Office of Personnel and the OTR and the DD/A's proposals have been presented, would it be possible for three representatives from those offices to get those papers together and try to synthesize it?

25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, can I ask you and Rud and [REDACTED] to work on that?

MR. WHITE: Fine.

MR. REYNOLDS: That is good.

Isn't there actually a rotation plan going on within DD/P itself? In our Weekly Report there was an indication from our Placement & Utilization Division that you had one of your own actually working.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Things are inter-working like that down there but I don't

think it's particularly on purpose.

MR. REYNOLDS: This one sounded like it had been working on purpose.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I don't think it is in any formalized form, Harry. I just think it's the result of everybody coming together and realizing that sort of thing has to go on to develop a well-rounded outfit.

MR. REYNOLDS: It came from your Career Service Boards, and I think there were 10 or 15 people being moved around within the DD/P, obviously for further training.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] rotates three at a time to field offices.

MR. [REDACTED] definitely improving. It's picking up sort of a momentum of its own.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: We are so much better off than we were two years ago, and we probably don't realize it and we are still probably a couple of jumps ahead of ourselves in our reactions around the Board here. And I think that is good.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, gentlemen, shall we proceed from this highly complex subject to a non-controversial issue, the Agency promotion policy? (Laughter)

The Personnel Office has prepared a brief summary of what has happened in the last year or year and a half, which has been placed in front of you on that dittoed sheet called CIA Promotion Policy. Then in your material sent to you by Mr. [REDACTED] you have the Communications Office promotion policy and the [REDACTED] on Promotions to Grade GS-15, and you have the draft of the Promotion Policy of the Office of Operations. So my only question is, which one do you want to talk from? I think the best thing to do is to establish exactly what criteria we want to set.

MR. [REDACTED] Are our deliberations in any way affected by what I understand is rapidly becoming the policy of the so-called Super Grade Board?

MR. WHITE: I was going to say, in view of the ramifications of competitive promotion that came out and were not solved in any way at all as affects super-grades alone, insofar as the competitive aspects of this thing and how it is going to work are concerned, I think we might do well to wait until we see whether or not the heads of all the major components can serve the super-grade components.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Red, I was just thinking with admiration of how

that line of L. K. White's was receding very slowly.

The Super-grade Board in the previous discussion was agreed on. It is already established.

MR. WHITE: I think the one concrete thing which this Board can do, and frankly, I'm not sure that we can do much more at this time, is to come out with some Agency policy on time-in-grade to establish eligibility, which is only one small part of promotion policy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Up to GS-15. Why don't we take, then, as a starting point, page 4 of the Office of Communications' paper.

MR. [REDACTED] You are a stern man, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Why?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The funny part about it is to compare that with what OO wants to do, and I think OO has always been on the liberal side in his promotion policy, if you agree with that, Red and Harry? And the fact is that Commo starts out fairly stringent in the lower grades and OO gets stricter as it gets higher.

MR. [REDACTED]: That follows Civil Service very closely, doesn't it?

[REDACTED] You will notice that reviewing element in the sentence just before that. This is only at the time they are brought up for review.

MR. [REDACTED] That is the critical point in time-in-grade, as I see it. It only means you won't be considered seriously before that time has elapsed.

[REDACTED] An item that came to my attention today, under this schedule, there are ten GS-12's all eligible for consideration to four slots. So I am going to be forced to adopt the "best qualified" system and select those people up, otherwise it's just not going to work. They are all in about the same category in order of merit.

MR. [REDACTED] And any of these ten are technically qualified to fill the four slots?

[REDACTED]: What are you going to do? I think we are going to have to consider a selection based on the best qualified.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, you are in competitive promotions whether you want it or not.

[REDACTED] Within my Office.

Incidentally, this is not a promotion policy, this is a procedure

for the Career Service Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any comment on these requirements?

MR. WHITE: It takes a man 14 years to get to be a Grade 15.

MR. [REDACTED] How much longer does he have in a career?

[REDACTED] They would all be chiefs and there would be no Indians.

MR. AMORY: But conversely, if you have a thing like this, say 24 months from a grade 12 to 13 - you go out and hire a guy 36 or 40 years old and you don't really know how good he is. You think he is going to be well worthwhile, but it's a one-out-of-three shot that he is damn well going to be a Division chief but quick.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would be more like one out of 100.

[REDACTED] Paragraph "c" applies in those cases, Mr. Amory.

MR. AMORY: I realize you have the exception, but I think the idea, say in 15 years a fellow can get up to 15, that is, assuming he goes to work for you at 22 or 23, then this is a darn good course. But if you have taken the guy out of the Army, out of business, out of the academic life, or something like that, I just don't think we want to impose on ourselves any more rigidity than is necessary. In business you advance people according to their ability and energy, and this, that and the other thing. And I think the more we can preserve that flexibility which, thank God we have in this Agency more than in the Post Office and other places -

MR. [REDACTED] But you have to have some policy or you get off on inequities.

MR. [REDACTED] But this is sheer chaos. I believe that you can have a system that is flexible and simple and will work.

[REDACTED] This was written for an office in which almost 95 or 90 per cent come in below a 7. It's an exception to take anybody in at a 9. I think we took one in at a 12. This was written for a different kind of an office than some of the others.

MR. AMORY: You hire a Ph.D., say 27 or 28, probably at a GS-12. Now he may remain a 12 for 20 years if all he can do is be a good scholar. But if he shows executive ability, imagination and that kind of thing, like [REDACTED] or somebody like that, then you would want to make him a 15 quick, just to get him over other individuals. You can't put a guy in command if he is actually

25X1A9a junior in grade.

MR. [REDACTED] But the discrepancy is that we have hired a great many at a nine. The normal grade for a Ph.D. is a 9.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That, incidentally, is quite a morale factor, because we do exactly that, we hire on one side of the house at one level and on the other side at another level.

MR. WHITE: And there is a lot of talking going around: "Why do you fool around with that outfit over there? Come with us." That is why I believe we should have some method.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Aren't we close to Civil Service? I don't mean we ought to be Civil Service.

25X1A9a MR. WHITE: You mean as to time-in-grade?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Civil Service has abandoned that.

[REDACTED] This has a good effect on the personnel in my office because now they know there is some system and they can't importune their supervisors to put in strong recommendations to get them considered out of order with somebody else. We have made exceptions. We took a Lieutenant Colonel in the Air Force, the Board took him on as a 9 when he should have been taken on as a 12. Well, we rectified that as soon as we could get him into a slot where he belonged.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me ask one question of the Board as a whole: How many of the Board members think there ought to be a schedule such as this for bringing people into the zone of consideration for promotions?

MR. REYNOLDS: I think so.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think so.

(Complete count of show of hands not made by Reporter)

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How many think there shouldn't be?

MR. AMORY: What was the question?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: My question is, do you think there should be a cross-Agency schedule such as this, by which all individuals will know that if they are in grades 2, 3 or 4, they do not come into the zone of consideration for promotion unless they have served six months.

MR. AMORY: Yes, I am in favor of a schedule.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And it would be understood such is a schedule solely for bringing people into consideration for promotion. It does not mean

they will be promoted at the end of that time; in fact, they may remain in a grade for the rest of their life.

MR. AMORY: The other side of that coin would be that if they occupied a position with a slot higher than that, the normal presumption would be that having served out this thing they should be promoted, because if not they are misassigned. If you have a guy as a 12 in a 14 slot--and assume a schedule was adopted for say 24 months--then in the normal situation you would promote or boot him.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: As a supervisor you are waving a two-headed axe over your head, because if the man isn't qualified he should be down-graded.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But you have the situation where the grade was arrived at because of the person who held the job, but maybe his successor was not quite the same kind of a person and maybe he did not do the same kind of a job. There would be chaos if you down-graded every time that occurred. There are many cases throughout the Agency, however, where people are in slots a couple of grades higher, and, properly, they are not promoted to those grades.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But the individual should be told that: (a) he is in the slot temporarily; and (b) when somebody comes along better qualified, he has had it.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] There is another factor, Kirk, in your proposition, and that is that 2, 3 and 4's will be assured of consideration; in other words, consideration is mandatory within a certain period of time. They just don't get overlooked.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That is applicable all the way through. This brings him up for consideration at least by that time, if not sooner.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: That really puts you into a type of promotion system which can be handled on a flexible basis by your board. Isn't that about the size of it?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This is by all outs the most sensible paper on promotion I have ever seen in this outfit.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] It is expanding rapidly. It has expanded over 300 per cent since Korea. We knew what the jobs were but we couldn't push them up. But now we are getting to the point where the ceiling has frozen and people have been with us long enough now to give us a good idea of what their potential is. There is no uniformity--with all due regard to Wage and

Classification--in the relative values of slots. You don't know how they can compare. It's an extremely difficult thing, and I think semantics has a lot to do with it. If you call it a "diesel mechanic" that's a 7 or maybe a 9, but maybe it turns out he's chief of a power plant of KPT generators and then he's an "engineer" and not a "diesel mechanic". I don't know that it can ever be done - that it can be leveled out.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Wasn't there another factor which preceded this? Namely, your norm system, which was sort of an intermediary step to take the major inequities out of your grade structure? Is it worth discussing that?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] We are going back to something like that. We set up certain factors of norm such as age, formal education above high school, length of time with CIA or predecessor organizations, and then those are all added up, which came to a norm for that grade. Say in grade 9 the norm was 27.5. Then we began comparing people to try to level them off. That worked well until we got them leveled off.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] And then you abandoned it?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Not completely. We are going to have to go back again to something like that for selection of the best qualified. Well, not really for the best qualified. I think the Air Force had considered them for promotion if they were qualified, and everybody was qualified, practically. So then they had to go to best qualified and that causes people, presumably the leaders, to step up and get promoted over the people who are qualified but not "best qualified". I am going to have to go back into something like a norm system.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] That isn't binding. It's only a means of highlighting or pointing out a man for more serious consideration.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] It flagged him for consideration. If the norm for his grade, let's say a 7, was 21 something, and you added or calculated the norms for all the GS-7's and you found one man who had a norm of 35 or 40, you examined him to find out: Was he a forgotten man? Well, that process has been completed now. We have corrected many of the inequities due to a flexible standard or no standard of hiring.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, it seems to me we are in agreement that there should be a cross-Agency time-in-grade criteria for selection to promotion. We are also in agreement that in issuing any such statement it should be very carefully phrased so that it is made known that this does not necessarily mean

promotion will take place. But it DOES mean the individual will be considered at those particular times and grades.

We also seem to be in agreement that this should be supplemented and simultaneously implemented with a standardized criteria for hiring into the grade, particularly as far as degrees are concerned, across the Agency, so that we don't get disparate results in different parts of the Agency.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Do we have to tie those both together, Kirk?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think it is so difficult. You are going to get your specialized jobs, of course, but I do think we are going to have an increasing problem if a Ph.D. comes into the DD/P area as a 9 and suddenly realizes that he could have come into the DD/I area as an 11 or 12, - if one side of the house hires on the basis of the more degrees you have the more money you can get, and the other side doesn't care whether you have a degree or not beyond the basic one.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Putting too much criteria on an academic degree is dangerous. There are a lot of people who work summers to get a degree just because that means they get a grade raise, but that doesn't mean they are scholars at all.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That should be one of the factors, but only one. Age and a good many other things go into that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] You recognize there are still inequities in hiring, but by not having a minimum time-in-grade and having, rather, a normal time-in-grade, you are then enabled to promote faster the people who have been hired at too low a level or who have spent too long a time at some lower grade. And that has also happened. But if you do establish a normal time-in-grade at which your case is subject to mandatory consideration, then I think half our problems are over. People know where they stand, or at least know during that period and for such time afterwards, and we are not bothered by the constant stream of demands for promotion, which, when we satisfy them as we have been satisfying them, come so fast that practically everybody in the Agency is going to be in grade 15 or 20 years, the last two-thirds of his career. It's that very pressure

25X1A9a that has brought about too rapid promotion in the outfit.

MR. [REDACTED] And it's always corrected by moving upward rather than downward. I don't know of anybody who ever went downward.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Oh, yes. They have either been down-graded or

out-graded, and there is a surprising number of those.

MR. AMORY: Well, to get on with the business, Kirk, the motion will be in order that the OO Notice, the last sheet or two there, as the qualifications? With the appropriate words changed? As I take it, Joe, where it says "the following time-in-grade prerequisites" will mean you will serve 21 months in a 13? I don't think the language is particularly happily chosen.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] To serve in grade as a GS-13 21 months before you are considered for promotion to a 14.

MR. AMORY: I feel very strongly that something in the order of two years should be the highest figure that we put down, to preserve this flexibility that I talked about. It may well be just because there wouldn't be enough 15's open that the average time for serving in a mature office like yours or in ORR would be six to ten years. The fact is, if you have a vacancy and a darn good guy, I think that is long enough to demonstrate it. If he is very young, that is another reason for holding him back. But I don't think the 48 months in

25X1A

[REDACTED] would be palatable, to my mind, in my side of the shop.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What I think you ought to do, Bob--I know you are in the middle of a motion, but if I can join the motion I think we should ask Personnel to draft a time-in-grade statement along the lines that we have discussed today.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Because the gimmick in this is as you go from office to office you find out the number of people to be considered in different grades vary so dramatically from office to office that unless you try to find some norm, which won't be realistic for [REDACTED] but which will be for us, and vice versa, we can't have a general Agency problem. I venture to say,

25X1A9a

25X1A

[REDACTED], that if you ran statistics on your employees, probably the number of total personnel that you have between the grades of 7 and 11, is probably damn near 89 or 90 per cent of all of your people.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] It probably is. We have done that, and what I have been trying to do is to get a pretty flat bottom pyramid, sort of shaped like this (indicating) as you come up. With the exception of grade 11 it pretty nearly conforms to that shape.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Whereas in Amory's shop you have a large concentration in 13, 14 and 15. It's probably an inverted pyramid.

MR. AMORY: ONE is virtually that.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] So we have to find some kind of a norm that we can all use.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Those statistics are available for each office, but, as you remember, at the last meeting we decided we were not going to distribute those figures. They are available to the head of each office, to see what his pyramid is.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] This ought to be turned over to the Personnel Office to try to find that norm which seems most applicable in terms of every office.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then in view of Red's statement, in which I concur, that discussions now going on in the so-called Super-Grade Board in re competitive promotion, etc., it would probably be foolish on our part to try to join issue with that battle at the moment. And if we can handle this time-in-grade as being one aspect of promotion policy which should be standardized, that would be at least one blow for freedom.

MR. REYNOLDS: We would be delighted to do it. It is one of the most difficult problems we have to face.

MR. WHITE: If you establish this norm, we all recognize there are going to be exceptions on both sides. We ought to have something that has enough teeth in it. An awful lot of personnel actions all the way up to include grade 15 are signed by the administrative officers of a Division, etc. We ought to make sure that the exceptions receive consideration at a certain level. I don't know whether that is the Assistant Director.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: It certainly is. If you don't do that you haven't got a system.

MR. WHITE: And write such a thing so that the exception doesn't become the rule.

MR. AMORY: I think your phraseology is good on the guide. I pass on all 11's myself, but it gets routine.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But we're agreed that we do want something on the order of this paragraph 2.d. of the OO paper?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are.

25X1A9a

Any new business to come up?

MR. [REDACTED] I have two Career Development Slots.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: These are the ones that we considered last time?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] They had not been staffed by the Office of Training and

Personnel. They have now been staffed and both are approved, both by the Office of Personnel and by Training. There are now 25 of the 40 slots obligated. This would add two more to the 25, leaving a balance of 13 slots out of 40 unobligated if these are approved.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Of which five will become free by the end of the year?

MR. [REDACTED] Approximately, yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any objection to these two Career Development Slots?

Hearing none, the Board considers them approved.

MR. [REDACTED] Kirk, it is important in connection with those two to recognize that OCD is asking also for [REDACTED] but they have not been able to get their papers to us yet.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: When they get their papers to us we will consider it.

MR. [REDACTED] They would prefer [REDACTED] to these other two.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other business, Mr. [REDACTED]

MR. [REDACTED] No.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have a paper submitted to me by the Director of Training on multi-purpose slots. Do you want to present that to the Board formally?

MR. [REDACTED] Yes. That has been discussed, however, in past meetings. This is the paper with examples of types of people who are not fully utilized in any one office at any one moment, but are worth saving for the Agency. The Board requested this paper.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would recommend the Secretary reproduce it so the Board can read it.

MR. [REDACTED] We have it right here and can distribute it today.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other new business? We stand adjourned.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. . . .